



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—PROBLEMS IN DELPHIAN CHRONOLOGY.

The inscriptions from Delphi have given us a fairly complete list of the archons of the third century, but, as yet, scholars have been unable to determine their chronological order with exactness. Prosopographical evidence is in many documents the sole criterion, and this allows a wide margin of variability; for the active public life of a citizen in this small community might extend over thirty or forty years, and we cannot always be certain that senator Chares may not be son or grandson of Chares who held office a few years previously. Some help may be gained from the history of Aitolian alliances, or enmities, during the period of Aitolian supremacy at Delphi; for the Delphians would hardly venture to make a grant to a citizen of a state with whom Aitolia was at war. The style of the writing may sometimes be used as a help in determining the date, but this criterion may be abused even by an expert, and when epigraphists such as Colin and Pomtow vary by thirty or forty years in dating certain archons, it is evident that conclusions based solely on letter forms cannot be viewed without grave suspicion. The most important of the Delphian documents for establishing the chronology are the Amphiktyonic decrees. When Delphi came under Aitolian domination after the repulse of the Gauls, Aitolia took her place amongst the members of the Amphiktyonic Council, and, as her League expanded, she added to her representation in the Council by taking over the votes once held by the newly won territory. This growth was not consistently steady throughout the century but fluctuated with the fortunes of the Aitolian League. She had two votes in Hieron's archonship, nine in Aristagoras', six in Athambos', fourteen in Nikarchos' year. It is evident, therefore, that when we can trace the various steps in the League's expansion, we have an invaluable means of determining the dates of the Amphiktyonic decrees. Unfortunately, the literary records of the Aitolian League are few and much of our knowledge of its growth

has to be determined from the inscriptions. In most cases, therefore, this argument runs in a circle and proves nothing. We find a most important means of dating these documents in the fact that Makedon and Makedonian dependents sent no delegates to the Council during the period of Aitolian supremacy. The reason is no doubt political and a question of prestige. Aitolia and Antigonos were generally on friendly terms, or perhaps we might call the attitude of Aitolia that of benevolent neutrality. We can not find the reason for Makedon's refusal to share in the proceedings of the Council in Aitolia's attitude but rather in that of Antigonos.¹ When he had become firmly established on his throne, Aitolia already controlled the policies of the Council either by her own votes or by those of friendly states. If Makedonian representatives were to attend, they would either have to follow Aitolia's lead or be outvoted. Antigonos had two alternatives before him, either to attempt to deprive Aitolia of her leadership by force or to abstain from the Council altogether. He had no particular quarrel with Aitolia and he chose the latter policy, incidentally bidding the subject states to do likewise. Previous writers on Delphian chronology have not always taken full account of this situation in dating the Amphiktyonic decrees. For example, Ferguson² dates the independence of Athens ca. 229 while Pomtow³ places the archon Athambos, in whose year Athens had a representative at the Council, in 236. One or both of these dates must be wrong. Again, Colin and Pomtow date Lyson in 243, in whose archonship an Athenian of the tribe Ptolemais was given certain honors, while writers on Athenian chronology claim that Ptolemais was not created until at least ten years later. Therefore, if excuse be needed for the present study, we plead that greater precision in the chronology of the third century has been attained in recent years and that new light has been thrown on the political affiliations of many of the Greek states during that period, and we believe that by means of this evidence a more exact dating of some of the Delphic documents may be obtained.

¹ Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 212 ff., defines very clearly the relationship of Antigonos to Aitolia.

² Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 231.

³ His latest chronological tables are published in *Klio* 1914, 305.

All those who have studied the Delphic inscriptions, will readily agree that the Amphiktyonic decrees must be the starting-point for any discussion of the chronology during Aitolian domination. Pomtow made the first important contribution to the study of this group of decrees.¹ He was followed by Beloch, who made the growth of the Aitolian League the basis of his investigations, but who, though his researches mark a considerable advance, carried out his theories in too mechanical a fashion, not allowing for such fluctuations in the history of the League as were caused, for example, by the war with Demetrios.² Nikitsky has also contributed a series of articles on this group of decrees, but, unfortunately for us, his work is in Russian and inaccessible. We have been able to use his results only in so far as they have been incorporated by Pomtow in his recent articles. Walek has taken the Amphiktyonic Council as the subject of his doctoral thesis.³ His work is more interesting as a youthful polemic against Pomtow and Beloch than as a valuable contribution to the subject. Yet it is valuable as a reference work and in some points has corrected errors made by his predecessors. The last discussion of the subject comes from Pomtow⁴ who in summing up all the available evidence gives much that is new and establishes the succession of certain archons whose date had been undetermined. Colin and Bourguet have promised a chronological study of the third century, but, if we may judge by the list published by Colin,⁵ the variations from that published by Pomtow will not be great—at least as regards the date of the Amphiktyonic decrees.

In our opinion the key of the whole problem of the chronology of Groups I-IV of the Amphiktyonic Decrees lies in Group II.⁶ Here Pomtow and all scholars succeeding Beloch

¹ *Jahrb.* 1894, 497-558; 1897, 737 ff., 785 ff. Pauly-Wissowa, RE, s. v. Delphoi. Cf. Baunack, SGDI II 939 ff.

² *Klio* II (1902), 205 ff. Republished with corrections *Gr. Gesch.* III 2. 322 ff.

³ *Die delphische Amphiktyonie in der Zeit der aitolischen Herrschaft.* A review of this thesis by Ruesch (*GGA* 1913, 125 ff.) is interesting.

⁴ *Klio* 1914, 265 ff.; cf. *GGA* 1913, 143 ff.

⁵ *Fouilles de Delphes* III 2. 392 ff.

⁶ This numbering is given to accord with Pomtow's latest arrangement. It would have been better if he had eliminated such lettering as Ia, VIIa, VIIb and numbered these lists consecutively.

in both Delphian and Athenian chronology have accepted Beloch's dates without question. The archons in this group are Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton who follow in the order named. From the Amphiktyonic decrees dated in their archonships we learn that Athens, Eretria, and Sikyon were now represented at the Council. If we accept Beloch's conclusions we must assume that the two former states were independent of Makedon at this time and that Sikyon had finally shaken off the tyrants who had so long held the government in their grip. In reopening this subject, the only possible method of investigation is to take up the threads of the history of these three states and see where they lead us. We must determine what conditions existed in Athens, Eretria, and Sikyon in 273-271, and, if Beloch is incorrect in his interpretation of their history at that time, we must find some consecutive period of three years which does satisfy all conditions.

Since we have a more complete knowledge of Athenian than of Eretrian or Sikyonian history, we may properly consider the Athenian vote at the Council first. It is generally agreed that Group II cannot date before 279 or after 262. We are therefore justified in limiting our study to that period. The Chremonidean War raged between 267 and 262 when Athens was undoubtedly independent of Makedon and might easily have sent her delegate to the Council, although, according to Beloch's or Pomtow's arrangement of the Amphiktyonic decrees, none were sent. Between 279 and 268 is found one of the most obscure periods of Athenian history, for literary and epigraphical documents fail us almost completely and there is little unanimity amongst scholars in the interpretation of the records which undoubtedly do belong to this period. It is held by some that Athens was twice independent and twice under Makedonian dictatorship during these years. Others maintain that Athens was subject to Antigonos during the entire period. Should the latter prove to be the case, Beloch's dates for Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton must be rejected at once.

The chief arguments for the independence of Athens in 279-268 are as follows: Athenian troops helped to drive back the Gauls at Thermopylai; the Board of Administration served in the archonship of Glaukippos, who is dated by some

in 277/6; Athens sent an embassy to Pyrrhos after he had driven Antigonos out of Makedon; Aitolia invited Athens to share in the Soteria in the archonship of Polyeuktos when Aitolia and Antigonos were supposed to be at enmity with each other; the decree in honor of Demochares in the archonship of Pytharatos could not have been passed if Athens had been dominated by Makedon; last but not least, the decrees of the Council in Group II are accepted without question as belonging to this period and therefore prove beyond a doubt that Athens was independent in 273-271.

The last argument is a good example of reasoning in a circle and may be rejected at present. Of the others, we believe that none can be held as a proof that Athens was independent at any time between 279 and 268. They may be dealt with very briefly. In the first place it is evident that Athens became Makedonian in the archonship of Nikias Otryneus, which is proved by the fact that the *agonothete* was changed in the course of that year and the second incumbent was a pro-Makedonian.¹ There is no evidence that Athens became independent when the Gauls drove Antigonos out of his kingdom. It might have been possible to regain her freedom at that time, but the harbors were in the king's possession and no grain could be imported without his consent. If the Gauls were to ravage her fields, Athens would have been ground between the upper and the nether millstones. In this crisis of Greek civilization she preferred to remain loyal to Antigonos, a loyalty which was rendered easier because of the moderate rule of Phaidros, the agent of Antigonos at that time. Whether the Athenian troops at Thermopylai were sent by Athens or by Antigonos we do not know, but whatever their status, their presence there can not be used as an argument to prove the independence of the city.

The date of Glaukippos is bound up with the question of the secretary-cycle where we have a wide divergency of

¹ Syll.² 200, 213. Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 127 n. It should be noted that Kirchner in Syll.³ 365 follows Sundwall in assigning Glaukon's year of service as *agonothete* to 296/5, thus giving him an active public life of 50 years or more. He was still in high favor at the Egyptian court after 247 (*ibid.* no. 462). While this is possible, Koehler's dating is much to be preferred.

opinion.¹ Apart from our own particular theory, which we prefer to follow, there are many good reasons for believing that this archon must belong to the period of the Chremonidean War. If Glaukippos was archon in 277/6, Athens was independent because of the Board of Administration which is found in decrees of this archonship. The pro-Makedonians were also in power because the son of Phaidros was elected as *agonothete*. If Athens was independent in that year, it is strange that she should have come over to the side of Antigonos in the following year while Antigonos was still struggling with the Gauls and was apparently without resources or friends. The sacrifices for safety in the archonship of Glaukippos point to the fact that his year of office fell at a time when Athens was at war and in danger, and the prosopographical evidence favors a later date. In fact, it is practically certain that this archon belongs to the Chremonidean War and no inferences can be drawn from the decrees dated under him that Athens was independent in 277.

The story of the embassy from Athens to Pyrrhos comes from Justin. Unfortunately, no details are given and its purpose is left to conjecture. If it were merely congratulatory the historian would probably have made no mention of it in his brief summary. If an alliance was requested, Pyrrhos would hardly have refused and the fact would undoubtedly have been recorded. We are inclined to believe, therefore, that this embassy was not from the state but from the Nationalists who sought the help of Pyrrhos in throwing off the Makedonian yoke. They had not the courage to undertake a revolt unaided and powerful forces were needed to regain control of the harbors. Whatever the purpose of the embassy, it was apparently unsuccessful, for Pyrrhos paid no heed to Athens but went on to Sparta. It is important to note that Antigonos followed hard after him apparently without let or hindrance from Athens who might easily have barred the way if she were in alliance with Pyrrhos. But Athens was offering sacrifices for Antigonos in the archonship of Polyuktos and in the following year she was clearly of the same mind, for she publicly decreed thanks to the officials in charge of

¹ CP 1914, 248 ff., AJP 1915, 438 ff. Cf. Klio 1914, 269.

those sacrifices. We may readily conclude that the government of Athens was loyal to Antigonos in spite of his reverses at the hands of Pyrrhos.

The invitation from Aitolia to Athens to join in celebrating the Soteria can imply that Athens was independent only in the case that Aitolia and Antigonos were at enmity. Tarn believes that Aitolia gave support to Pyrrhos in transferring him across the Gulf of Corinth.¹ If this was the route actually taken by the king on his way to Sparta we must grant that the neutrality of Aitolia was being stretched to the limit. That Aitolia was ever at war with Antigonos or actively supporting his enemies, there is no evidence whatsoever. Athens could take part in the Soteria without being independent or without sending representatives to the Amphiktyonic Council. This is clearly shown in the "Soteria" inscriptions. We do not believe therefore that the invitation extended in the archonship of Polyeuktos can carry any implication that Athens was at that time independent.

The decree of Laches in honor of Demochares has been used to prove that Athens was free in 271. Ferguson² however has shown that this document is skilfully worded so as not to give offence to Antigonos. Moreover Diogenes Laertios³ has recorded a conversation between Demochares and Zenon which seems to imply that the former had been admitted to the friendship of the king and was in the habit of corresponding with him. In that case the decree of Laches would not have given offence to the king and may have been prompted by him.

These are the arguments which have been cited to prove that Athens was independent at certain times between 279 and 268 B. C. While we are willing to admit that our interpretation of this evidence may appear to be biassed by our particular prejudices and theories about this period, yet we contend that these arguments, singly or collectively, can not be used to prove that Antigonos had ever lost his grip on the city. There is, on the other hand, no lack of evidence to show that Athens was Makedonian. In the archonship of Nikias

¹ Tarn, *op. cit.*, 266 n.

² *Op. cit.*, 169-173. Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 268.

³ VII 14.

Otryneus, the pro-Antigonid Phaidros was elected *agonothete*.¹ In the archonship of Euboulos Athens was still a Makedonian state as the decree in honor of Phaidros shows.² The large erasures in this document must have contained references to Demetrios and Antigonos and could only have been written when Makedonian interests were dominant. Athens sent no *hieromnemon* to the Council when Hieron was archon at Delphi. This fact implies that the city was under Makedonian control ca. 278-275. Sacrifices were offered to Antigonos in the archonship of Polyeuktos, and in the following year the government thanked those who had offered them. Diogenes Laertios says that Antigonos often came to Athens in Zenon's lifetime. It is clear that the king must have been so thoroughly occupied with military campaigns from 279 to 272 that these visits must have been rare during these years. We must suppose, therefore, that these trips to his intellectual capital took place in the four or five years that followed the death of Pyrrhos and preceded the Chremonidean War. Finally, all the inscriptions which surely belong to the years 279-268 show that the Department of Administration was in charge of a single officer, a fact which points to Makedonian domination during those years.³

The whole trend of the literary and epigraphical evidence dealing with the history of Athens between 279 and 268 seems clearly in favor of the theory that Athens was Makedonian during that period. On this score alone the arguments of Beloch in favor of dating Group II of the Amphiktyonic decrees in 273-1 might be rejected. When we turn to the history of Eretria and Sikyon the evidence, though scanty, is overwhelmingly against his dates for this group of decrees. Apparently his interpretation of this evidence led him to say that the Athenian vote at the Council must *antedate* the Chremonidean War. This part of his argument must therefore be examined with the greatest care.

The relation of Eretria to Makedon in the seventies is bound up with the story of the death of Menedemos. There are two traditions.⁴ According to one, Menedemos proposed a decree of congratulation to Antigonos for his victory over the Gauls at Lysimacheia (ca. 276). Since the actual word-

¹ Cf. page 149, note 1.

² AJP 1915, 438 ff.

³ IG II² 682.

⁴ Diog. Laert. II 141 ff.

ing of the decree is given this part of the story may be genuine, and would be conclusive proof that the city was Makedonian at the time, but the historian goes on to say that the Eretrians were so enraged at the proposed decree that they banished Menedemos who fled to Oropos whence he was driven out on the charge that he had stolen some golden vessels from the shrine of Amphiaraos. After wandering about for some time he finally reached Makedon where he died in great wretchedness. This version of the fate of Menedemos, which is accepted by Beloch, is not only improbable in itself, but is flatly denied by Antigonos of Karystos—a contemporary of Menedemos—who says that Menedemos went to the court of the king who had once been his pupil and begged him to restore his country's freedom. Antigonos wished to grant his request but finally, on the advice of Persaios, refused to do so. Menedemos was so grieved that he starved himself to death. Herakleides and Diogenes Laertios support this version of the story and in our opinion there is little doubt that it is the correct tradition. Eretria must have been held by the garrisons of Antigonos at the time of Menedemos' death or ca. 272. Persaios probably arrived at the court of Antigonos ca. 275. He must have been there some time if his influence could outweigh that of Menedemos over his former pupil and friend. It is possible that Menedemos did not prefer his request until after the death of Pyrrhos when Antigonos was at last securely seated on his throne. In any case, the evidence that Eretria was independent in this period may be safely rejected as unsound. We believe, therefore, that Beloch's argument for the date of Group II, in so far as it is based on the Eretrian vote at the Amphiktyonic Council, cannot be considered as a valid one and must be rejected.

Beloch's strongest argument for dating Group II in 273-271 is found in his interpretation of Sikyonian history. Fortunately, the literary tradition here is direct and there is no conflict of ancient authorities, though Beloch has allowed himself unusual freedom in dealing with his sources.

In 251 Aratos led the attack which won the freedom of his native city Sikyon. According to Polybios, he was then twenty years of age.¹ He was appointed general of the Achaian

¹ Polybios II 43. 3.

League for the second time in 243. His first appointment must have been in 245¹ at the latest. Beloch maintains that he could not have held this office before the age of thirty and that we must accordingly interpret the statement of Polybios as meaning that Aratos was "ein Zwanziger" in 251 or about 25 or 26 years old. This argument is wholly untenable. In the first place Polybios is too precise to use his numerals in such a vague manner and no example of this indefinite method of expressing age is known to us from the classical authors. Nor is it likely that Polybios is making a mistake about the age of his hero. In compiling his history he undoubtedly had the Memoirs of Aratos before him and we may eliminate the possibility of an error.² Moreover, Plutarch emphasizes the extreme youth (*μεγάκιον*) of Aratos in recording his earlier achievements. We should therefore accept the statement of Polybios at its face value and put the birth of Aratos in 271 and not in 276/5 as Beloch does. This is a most important date, for on the year of Aratos' birth depends all Delphian chronology for the third century and much that is vital in Athenian and Eretrian history. From the date established by Beloch, he and succeeding scholars have dated Group II of the Amphiktyonic lists and most of the Delphian archons between 279 and 230. And from this evidence the independence of Athens and Eretria in 273-271 has been inferred.

We must now take the year 271 as our pivotal point and arrange our chronological scheme accordingly. Aratos was seven years old when his father Kleinias was slain by Abantidas. Thus the democratic government which had been in existence for a very short time was overthrown and a tyranny re-established. It was during this short era of democracy, which we must date in the year or years preceding the assassination of Kleinias in 264, that Sikyon once more sent her delegate to the Amphiktyonic Council. As Tarn suggests, the democratic uprising in Sikyon may have been a direct outcome of the influence of Ptolemy in bringing about the Chremonidean war.

¹ Plutarch, Aratos 16. Polybios XX 4.

² Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.*, 361 n.

The results of our investigations may be summed up very briefly. All the evidence shows that Sikyon must have sent her delegates to the Council in or immediately preceding the year 264. Secondly the balance of evidence is decidedly in favor of the theory that Eretria belonged to Makedon at the time of and preceding Menedemos' death ca. 275-272. There is no trustworthy evidence which shows that this state was independent at any time between 279 and 268. Finally Athens came under Makedonian control in the year 280/79 and there is no proof that she became independent at any time before the Chremonidean War. Antigonos undoubtedly exercised only a mild form of tyranny over Athens and Eretria due to the fact that in each resided old teachers and friends for whom he had the greatest affection and respect. Both states were virtually free in so far as the exercise of all the usual forms of democracy went, but the presence of strong garrisons in Peiraeus and Chalkis was an ever-present reminder to these liberty-loving people that the iron hand was there. We may easily conclude that none of these states sent representatives to the Amphiktyonic Council before the outbreak of the Chremonidean War. Beloch's dates for Group II must therefore be discarded.

Having destroyed this sole island of safety in the vexed chronology of the Delphic archons, we must endeavor to re-establish it in some more secure spot where it will be immune from attack. In doing so, we must rebuild our chronological scheme on the sound political principle that no Greek state which acknowledged the authority of Makedon sent representatives to the Amphiktyonic Council while it was dominated by Aitolia.

Aristagoras, Charixenos, Herakleidas, Archiadas, Eudokos, and Straton may be grouped together; for they follow each other in the order named.¹ Under Archiadas and Eudokos alone do we find the Sikyonian delegation to the Council. The latest possible date for Eudokos must be 264/3 B. C. Archiadas therefore falls in 265/4, Herakleidas in 266/5, Charixenos in 267/6 and Aristagoras in 268/7. Straton succeeds Eudokos and must be dated in 263/2.² It will be

¹ Pomtow, GGA 1913, 143 ff.

² Here I make amends to Beloch for my criticism of his view that Straton must be dated in a pre-Pythian year.

noticed at once that Athens has no representatives in the Council in 268/7, but they appear for the first time at the Fall meeting in 267/6, that is, at the beginning of the Chremonidean War. Here is striking confirmation of the correctness of our chronology, for the Athenian and Sikyonian records are in complete agreement that both were free and independent at or within this period.

If we accept these dates for the archons of Groups Ia and II, and evidently we must do so, we have important confirmatory evidence for the date of the beginning of the war. Of vastly more importance is the fixing of the Athenian chronology and the whole secretary-cycle for the first half of the third century, since Peithidemos, in whose year the decree of Chremonides was passed, must now be settled in 267/6 and Philokrates must go in 266/5 thereby definitely establishing the tribe Demetrias in the rotation of the secretaries in that year.¹ The decrees of the Council may also be used as evidence that Eretria at least and possibly a great part of Euboia became independent of Makedon. No mention is made of this state in the decree of Chremonides and we must assume that Eretria gained her freedom after that decree was passed but before the autumnal meeting of the Amphiktyonic Council. It is quite possible that Eretria did not join the alliance against Antigonos, but it would be difficult to understand how she could remain neutral after the stroke which won her freedom. Whether Chalkis succeeded in getting rid of the Makedonian garrison is questionable. In the archonship of Straton we find amongst the hieromnemons this entry: *Εὐβοέων Ἀμφικράτους Χαλκιδέος*. The addition of the chorographic adjective at this period is unusual and probably has some special significance, the nature of which we are not yet in a position to define. The history of Chalkis during the war is veiled in Stygian darkness. Scholars have usually assumed that this post remained under the control of Antigonos until the revolt of Alexander some years later ca. 253/2. This opinion may have to be revised.

These Amphiktyonic decrees not only help us to determine the beginning of the Chremonidean War but they enable us to fix its duration. In the Fall meeting in 262 Athens had a

¹ CP 1914, 248 ff.; 1915, 457 ff.

delegate at the Council.¹ We know from other sources that Athens fell about September or October of that year. Evidently the Council met before the surrender. Athens sent no more representatives until she regained her freedom in 233/2. The other votes which we find in these decrees tell us little beyond what we already know about the Chremonidean War. We cannot tell whether Sikyon took any part in it, but it may be noted that the murder of Kleinias and the reestablishment of a tyranny followed hard after the victory of Antigonos over the Spartans. It would seem as if this were a direct result of the decline in the Allies' fortunes, and it may be that Sikyon was ranged against Antigonos as well.

After the Chremonidean War all the states of the Peloponnese disappear from the records of the Council if we except the Spartan vote which was registered in the archonship of Kallikles. The Achaian League followed the policy of Antigonos in holding aloof from a Council whose proceedings they could not dominate. It is more difficult to understand why the other members of the Council who did not belong to the Achaian League should abstain from attending. Possibly the influence of Antigonos may have extended farther than we are accustomed to believe. It is evident, too, that much is yet to be learned about the history of Sparta in this period.

By shifting the group Aristagoras-Straton from 276-271 to 268-263, the arrangements of the archons subsequent to 279 must be changed. Pomtow places Erasippos in 279. In this archonship a decree was passed by which Glaukon, the brother of Chremonides, was made *proxenos*. It is probable that such a gift would not have been conferred when Athens was Makedonian, but it can be dated with comparative certainty in the days of Athenian independence. Since there is no available place for Erasippos during the Chremonidean War, we do not hesitate to date this archon in one of the vacant years between 288 and 280—possibly ca. 282.

Hieron may belong anywhere between 278 and 275 or 273 and 272 according to Beloch. We are inclined to believe that the latter alternative is not to be considered. The victories of Pyrrhos do not mean that Thessaly became independent of

¹ Klio 1914, 285.

Makedon in 273. She only experienced a change of masters, for Pyrrhos was not making this wild raid through Makedon for any altruistic ideas in regard to the liberties of smaller nations. Probably we should date the decree as late as possible in the years 278-275, for we doubt whether these privileges accorded to the *technitai* were sought while the Gauls were still a real menace to safe travelling. In 276 Antigonos won his decisive victory at Lysimacheia and we may suppose that he turned his attention to the reduction of Thessaly very soon thereafter. Hieron may be dated ca. 276/5. [Could we bring into this connection the decree in which the Amphiktyons return thanks to Ptolemy and Antigonos for granting safe conduct to the sacred embassies, we would be justified in dating Hieron as late as possible. But the reference to the secretary of the Council seems to relegate this decree to the latter part of the century (cf. GGA 1913, 171 f.)].

Kraton is probably contemporary with, or immediately follows, the Attic archon Polyektos, as Pomtow has shown, but there are many reasons which forbid the dating of this archon in 277/6. Apart from our own construction of the Athenian secretary-cycle by which we date Polyektos in 273/2, it does not seem humanly possible that the Soteria could have been celebrated in 276/5. In the first place, the danger of a Gallic invasion was not removed until after the battle of Lysimacheia in 276, and it may be seriously doubted whether Aitolia had thought of instituting the festival until that time. Secondly, embassies had to be sent over the ancient world to win the approval of the various Greek city-states. Other preliminaries had to be arranged even after their approval was won. Means of communication were none too good and travel by sea none too secure, even for a neutral. The difficulty of arranging the Olympic games in modern times might offer a parallel. With all the advantages of speedy communication it takes years before all details are settled. Since the evidence from Athenian history establishes Polyektos in 273/2, the Soteria were not celebrated before 272/1, or four years after the battle of Lysimacheia. It is probable that Kraton should be dated in 272/1. The prosopographical evidence seems to favor this date rather than the middle of the century where Colin prefers to place him.

It is apparent from the decree of the Chians that the Soteria were to be held quadrennially when they were first instituted. Pomtow's restoration of that inscription seems to be correct and shows that they were to be held in the same year as the Olympic games.¹ As a matter of common sense we should expect that the new quadrennial festival would come midway between the Pythian festivals. The original plan was not long maintained but very soon the Aitolians decided to hold it oftener. At any rate, when we come to the "Soteria" group of inscriptions, the evidence is clear that the new games were either annual or biennial. Beloch and Walek hold that they were biennial.² Pomtow³ contends that they must be annual. Both base their arguments on Beloch's dates for the archons in Groups I-II, but, since we have rejected these dates, we must consider the evidence from our new point of view.

In dating Group III we have three lines of evidence, one of which is based partly on literary tradition. In the archonship of Emmenidas, a decree was passed in honor of Areus II, king of Sparta. The attempts of Bourguet⁴ and Pomtow⁵ to identify this Areus with Areus I may be rejected without comment. Areus I was killed at Corinth in 265/4, and his son Akrotatos met with a similar end ca. 262. Akrotatos left a son Areus who, though a mere babe, seems to have been crowned king. He died in his eighth year, hence not later than 254 and probably earlier. Emmenidas must therefore be dated between 262 and 254 and probably towards the upper limit.

The prosopographical evidence requires that we date Group III as early as possible.⁶ Telestes, for example, won a victory in 284 and again ca. 263 at Delos and in the archonship of Nikodamos at Delphi. While the active life of an actor might have easily been thirty or even forty years, it is probable that his victories could not have been beyond thirty years apart, and in most cases a shorter period must be assumed. The Athenian lists do not help us very much because we are far from accuracy

¹ Klio 1914, 272 f.

² Cf. page 147, notes 2 and 3.

³ GGA 1913, 178 ff.

⁴ BCH 1911, 488 ff. Cf. Tarn, *op. cit.* 304 n.

⁵ GGA 1913, 150 ff.

⁶ Cf. O'Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting*, p. 70.

in dating the actors of the third century, although the margin of error is probably not great. For our purposes we may confine ourselves to the evidence afforded by the Delian inscriptions. This is solely prosopographical, but in every case it favors the earliest possible dates for Group III. Nikodamos must be dated in a year when the Pythia were celebrated, and though it is possible that he should go in 254/3, yet it is very improbable. We should not hesitate to assign him to 258/7. It follows from this that the Soteria at that time must have been celebrated annually, for Aristagoras and Emmenidas must be placed in the three years immediately preceding Nikodamos. This would be impossible if the festival were biennial.

Our third chain of reasoning leads to the same conclusion, though all the links are not yet thoroughly tested. We may take it for granted that the Amphiktyonic decrees from the archonship of Kallikles and the so-called "Kallikles" group must lie in the interval between the Chremonidean War and the Boiotian War in 245/4. It is certain that Nikodamos and Dion belong to years when the Pythia were celebrated. If Dion is placed in 250 we are compelled to date Praochos in 246/5 since the succession of the archons in Group IV is definitely fixed. In that case Boiotia would have a representative at the Amphiktyonic Council in the spring of 245, or at a time when she was in open war with Aitolia.¹ This is clearly impossible and our only alternative is to date Dion in 254. Nikodamos must therefore be placed in 258. Since Aristagoras and Emmenidas fall between two successive celebrations of the Pythia we should have no further hesitation in asserting that the Soteria were annual by 260 at the latest. In all probability the change from a quadrennial to an annual festival was made in that year, for the period of the Chremonidean war would be most inopportune for inaugurating annual games and contests. Kallikles cannot be placed in the year of a Pythian festival according to our arrangement of the archons of this period.² The mem-

¹ Klio 1914, 310 f.; SIG I³ 444/5. On the date of the war see Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, 384.

² Pomtow seems to have abandoned his theory that Kallikles and Pleiston must belong to years when the Pythia were celebrated (GGA 1913, 149 f.; Klio 1914, 305). I think that he was justified in so doing, for it seems clear that Pleiston also must belong to a year immediately following that festival.

bership of the Amphiktyonic Council in his archonship seems to require that he be placed between Groups III and IV.

While it is not absolutely proved that the archons of the 'Soteria' group follow in immediate succession, it is probable that such is the case. The growth of the Aitolian vote from five to nine must have taken some time. We date Aristagoras therefore in 260/59 and Emmenidas in 259/8. Kleondas probably belongs in 257/6.

The Lakedaimonian vote at the Council in Kallikles' year is interesting. That Aitolia and Sparta were friendly in 259/8 is shown by the decree in honor of Areus II, but why no representatives came to the Council save in Kallikles' archonship remains a mystery.¹

Group IV is interesting in that we find the Chians represented at the Council for the first time. Dion is the first of this series as Pomtow has recently shown.² Amyntas and Nikaidas are not to be separated and follow in the order named. Since the senators in the archonships of Ameinias and Amyntas are identical, it is probable that Amyntas was archon *suffectus* and finished out the year of Ameinias. A similar situation is found in the case of Aristion and Archelas.³ We therefore date Ameinias in 253/2, Amyntas in 252/1 and Nikaidas in 251/0. From Praochos' archonship we have two Amphiktyonic decrees preserved, in one of which the Boiotian delegates are found but not in the other. Praochos is to be dated in 250/49.

We believe that the archons in Groups I-IV may now be regarded as dated with reasonable certainty. The names of many other archons of this period are found in decrees of the

¹ If Pomtow is correct in his theory that there was some form of rotation by which the Dorian states elected representatives for the Council, we might find the explanation there. It should be noted however that his theory does not work out in practice. Thus in the archonships of Charixenos and Herakleidas we find Argos represented in two successive autumnal sessions. It would seem as if Sikyon were also represented in two successive years in 265 and 264, although the change of delegate in the fall session of 264 may be explained on other grounds. Pomtow sets forth his theory in *Klio* 1914, 283 f.

² *Klio* 1914, 288 ff.

³ The clearest case is in the archonships of Herakleidas and Archiadas where the succession of the two archons is undoubted. Cf. Colin, *Fouilles de Delphes* III 2. 90, Bourguet, *ibid.* III 1. 300.

Delphian state. A few of these can be dated within fairly narrow limits on historical grounds, but in most cases we are compelled to rely solely on prosopographical evidence, which, unfortunately, allows a very wide latitude in dating. In a small community like Delphi we find many names recurring generation after generation, very much as we find Sandy MacDonald handed on in some Scottish hamlet. Supposing the Delphic senator became eligible for office at thirty, he might easily have an active public life of forty years more. By that time his grandson might be eligible for election, and in the third century we have no means of telling which is which. It can readily be seen that prosopographical evidence alone helps us but little. Our observations in the following paragraphs when based on this evidence by itself should therefore not be regarded as definitely settling the date of those archons.

A decree in Ariston's year confers honors upon Hieronymos, an Athenian whom Pomtow identifies as the hieromnemon in Straton's year.¹ If he is correct in this identification, it is probable that Ariston immediately follows Straton and Pomtow has correctly restored this archon's name in the decree published by him in *Klio* 1914, p. 285.

In the archonship of Androtimos honors were granted to a citizen of Histiaia. This state had representatives at the Amphiktyonic Council in 260/59 and 259/8. While it does not necessarily follow, yet it is probable that friendly relations between Aitolia and Histiaia were established at this time and that Androtimos should be dated ca. 260. The only vacancy is 261/0 and there he probably belongs. Pomtow has bracketed Androtimos and Achaimenes together, but the evidence for this seems as yet to be unpublished. If such evidence exists, then both archons must go in a different period—possibly ca. Group VI.

Aristion and Archelas belong together, one of them apparently completing the term of the other as archon *suffectus*. The political significance of their honorary decrees helps but little. Makedon and Aitolia were on friendly terms, for an Athenian was honored. The prosopographic evidence favors, if anything, a date before the Chremonidean War.²

¹ GGA 1913, 162 f.

² The fact that Aigina sent a hieromnemon to the Council in the archonship of Archelas (*Fouilles de Delphes*, III 1. 195) is significant.

Aiakidas was senator ca. 282 and Deinon is found in 293–263. These archons probably belong ca. 271–268.

There is wide divergence of opinion in regard to the date of Diodoros. Walek gives his limits as 246–240. Pomtow places him ca. 240/39 and Colin in 280–270. The honorary decrees indicate that the political situation was about the same as in Aristion's year. The prosopographical evidence is not against Colin's date and we are inclined to place this archon ca. 271.

Iatadas and Philon probably belong to this general period. The prosopographic evidence for the latter might place him in the second decade of the century. Peithagoras was senator ca. 310, and the name does not reappear until his archonship ca. 230. Aristion, Theoteles, and Herakleidas are names which occur frequently in the first half of the century, but disappear in the second half.

We are inclined to believe that Theoteles should antedate the period of Aitolian domination, in spite of the fact that an Aitolian receives the honors of the state. The senator Xenostratos is found ca. 307/6. It should be noted that the name Etymondas is very common in the fourth century, but is never found in political activities under Aitolian domination until we come to the very end of the third century. It is possible that we have in this case a Delphic family that was politically out of sympathy with the Aitolian régime and took no part in Delphian public life for that reason. A detailed comparison of the prosopography of the fourth and third centuries might yield some interesting results in this connection. The fourth senator's name is read by Bourguet as Age(as), but it may be restored as Age(las) who was also senator in 285 or Age(tor) who appears in Archelas' year.

Orestas undoubtedly belongs to the early part of the century because of a *stoichedon* inscription which dates from his archonship.¹ Prosopographic evidence lacks definiteness. Lykinos is found in 292 and 262; Menandros in 269 and 264; Kriton in

Aigina must have been independent and we are inclined to date that decree in the latter part of the century, possibly ca. 228 or immediately before Aigina joined the Achaian League. Another alternative is to date the document in the latter part of the fourth century prior to Makedonian domination.

¹ Bourguet, Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 135.

289, 267, 264, and in archonships of Thessalos and Euthyon. Lysidamos appears only in 285 and Aristoxenos in 294 and 281. Orestas is probably not to be placed later than ca. 286.

Bourguet and Pomtow agree in transferring the senators Echemmas, Kraton, Philondas, Ison, and Alkineidas from Xenochares II to Xenochares I. (Bourguet denies the existence of No. II.) It is probable that we should therefore transfer Timokrates II to this neighborhood because of the unusual name Echemmas which appears in both archonships. It may be quite possible that we should eliminate Timokrates II. If not, No. II belongs ca. 275.

The internal evidence for the dates of Xenokles, Ainesilas, and Kleu(timos) is very slight. The prosopographic evidence favors a period where all three can be grouped in reasonable proximity to one another. Praochos is found as senator ca. 293 and as archon in 250. Menes is found in 268 and it is possible that this name should be restored as the third senator in Kleu(timos') year. Since there is little room for these archons in the middle of the century, we prefer to place them in the vacant years of the seventies.

Onymokles and Herakleidas III antedate the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens as is shown by the demes and tribes of the Athenians honored in their archonships.¹ Colin dates Onymokles between 262 and 240. The prosopographical evidence favors a place near the upper limit, if we assume that Sogenes, the Delphian *proxenos*, is the grandfather of Sogenes recorded in IG II 403. If the two are identical, Onymokles must belong ca. 240. Herakleidas III must be prior to 245 because of the honorary decree for a Boiotian which was passed in this archonship.²

Aischriondas and Archidamos apparently belong about the middle of the century. Achaimenes is difficult to place by

¹ GGA 1913, 162 f.; Fouilles de Delphes III 2, No. 74.

² Pomtow bases much of his argument for his date of Herakleidas III on palaeography (Klio 1914, 315 f.). This kind of evidence must be handled with great caution, and, since Bourguet is willing to date the decree of Hypatodoros nearly half a century higher, we are not disposed to lay too much stress on the character of the letter-forms as a means of dating, especially when Pomtow himself is uncertain whether the decree of Neon, which he ascribes to Herakleidas III, may not equally well belong to the Herakleidas of ca. 292-280 (ibid. p. 320).

prosopographical evidence. The honors conferred on a Messenian in his year may possibly tend to bring this archon ca. 240 about which time Aitolia and Messene became allied (Syll.² 234; cf. Tarn, *op. cit.* 403 n.).

Some of the prosopographic evidence tends to throw Xenochares in relation to the senatorial groups of the forties. Possibly he and Boulon (?) should exchange places. Lyson must post-date the creation of Ptolemais at Athens, and goes to the last quarter of the century. Damochares should probably be placed along with Euthyon in the forties. Damotimos is dated by Pomtow in a year in which the Pythia were held, and, since he cannot go in 238, the only available date is 246 or 242.

We must assume that there were two archons named Nikarchos. One of these must antedate the creation of Ptolemais at Athens, for a citizen of Keiriadai in the tribe Hippothontis was granted an honorary decree in the archonship of Nikarchos.¹ When Ptolemais was created this deme was transferred from Hippothontis to the new tribe and, so far as we know, no part remained in its old tribal affiliations. If this Nikarchos were dated ca. 226 we should have to grant that Ptolemais was not created in the latter part of 233/2, or else that the deme Keiriadai was divided into two parts, of which only one was transferred to Ptolemais. Since neither of these alternatives is acceptable, we prefer to date Nikarchos I ca. 240 and Nikarchos II ca. 222, a year to which an Amphiktyonic decree from his archonship seems to belong. The political situation at Athens from 229 to the end of the century is still very obscure in most points. She sent representatives to the Council for a very short time after she gained her independence, and after 229 her delegates appear there only sporadically. The explanation may be sought in the relations of Athens and Aitolia, though we are loth to believe that active enmity existed in those years when Athens was absent. If such were the case, we should have undoubted proof of the existence of two archons named Nikarchos, for Athens had no representative at the Council in the archonship of Nikarchos II. The decrees of Nikarchos I must antedate the war between Aitolia and Demetrios. The prosopographic evidence is not decisive but does not preclude a date ca. 240.

It is evident from our dating of Onymokles, Herakleidas III, and Nikarchos I that the chronology of the Delphian archons is closely bound up with the question of the date of the establishment of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens. If Pomtow is correct in dating these archons, then Ptolemais could not have been established in 233/2, or else we must assume that the list of demes to be incorporated in that tribe should be revised. On the other hand, if our theory of the date for the creation of Ptolemais is correct, Pomtow's chronology cannot be accepted for the archons dated ca. 232. We think it advisable therefore to restate as briefly as possible our reasons for believing that Ptolemais was created in 233/2.¹

The whole question is intimately bound up with the rotation of the secretary-cycle and the date of the close of the Chremonidean War. When the war ended and the Nationalist party was replaced by the pro-Makedonian, it is generally agreed that the rotation of the secretary-cycle was broken and the new secretary was elected from the first tribe in the official order, Antigonis, as a mark of honor to the king. In the latter half of the third century the only fixed point in the cycle is 221, when Pandionis held the secretaryship. If we carry the rotation backward on the basis of twelve tribes in the cycle we find that Antigonis would hold the secretaryship in 261/0. If, however, we assume that Ptolemais was created in 233/2 then the secretaryship of Antigonis must belong to 262/1. The converse of this proposition follows with equal certainty, for if we can prove that the Chremonidean War ended in the early part of 262/1 and that all the officials of the Nationalist party were replaced by friends of Antigonos, the new cycle beginning in that year can be connected with that found in 221 by assuming that Ptolemais was inserted in the cycle in 232.

Philodemos records the fact that Athens fell and the war ended in the archonship of Antipatros "who preceded Arrheneides" (*ὁ πρὸ Ἀρρενείδου*). Furthermore, from Klearchos to Arrheneides is a period of 39 years and 3 months.² These two entries are unusual in form and Kolbe was the first to interpret them correctly. Antipatros and Arrheneides were archons in the same year, and after three months in office the former either

¹ Cf. AJP 1913, 381 ff.

² Mayer, *Philologus* 1912, 226 ff.

perished in the war or was removed by Antigonos on the capture of the city and the office was held by Arrheneides for the remainder of the year. By inclusive reckoning we date the fall of Athens within the first three months of the year 262/1. The new cycle begins with the archonship of Arrheneides in the fourth month of that year with Antigonis holding the secretaryship. That Philodemos reckoned by the inclusive method is clear from the evidence for Kleanthes' death. By exclusive reckoning that event would have to be dated in 230 or when Kleanthes would be 102 years old, thus contradicting all other evidence which is in accord in granting this philosopher a bare 100 years of life.¹

That Athens must have been independent of Makedon in 232 is clearly indicated, if not definitely proved, by the Delphic Amphiktyonic lists. A delegate from Athens is found in the Athambos-Pleiston group which Pomtow has dated in 236-232, but it is quite impossible that Athens became independent so early. Sacrifices for the royal Makedonian house were offered in Athens in 233, not long before the revolution. Nor can this series be brought down as late as 229, which is the date given by Ferguson for the independence of the city. It is unfortunate that the Delphian excavations have not as yet yielded the evidence which would enable us to date the Athambos-Pleiston group more precisely, but that it cannot be later than 232-228 seems beyond dispute. As a witness of her independence, Athens once more sent her representative to the Council. We shall have to leave to a later paper the problem of determining why she ceased to send a hieromnemon in 228, though she was still independent. The Athenian inscriptions also give clear proof that Athens had come under the control of the independent Nationalists headed by Eurykleides and Mikion before 229. They were undoubtedly the leaders in the revolt, and from their well-known affiliations with Egypt it may be assumed with equal certainty that they had the moral and financial support of Ptolemy. If Athens waited ten years to do honor to her benefactor, her gratitude is much belated and very strange. Undoubtedly the new tribe was created at once and given the

¹ Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* III 2. 472.

secretaryship for the following year. Since the sixth tribe held this office in 233, we have a reasonable explanation of the position of Ptolemais as seventh in the official cycle.

The arrangement of prytanies in the Attic decrees from the archonship of Diomedon to the end of the century shows that thirteen tribes were in existence during that period. Much of this evidence rests on restorations and therefore, in itself, cannot be used as conclusive proof, but may be regarded as valuable support for our theory.¹

It should also be noted that in Attic decrees between 260 and 233 mention of the Makedonian kings was generally excised in later times. Since these inscriptions are usually written *stoichedon* we can estimate the length of the excised formula with precision. In those decrees assigned by Ferguson and Kirchner to the reign of Antigonos the formula varied unaccountably from 38 to 60 letters. Under the new arrangement necessitated by inserting Ptolemais in the cycle in 232, the decrees with the longer formula belong to the reign of Demetrios and the shorter to Antigonos.²

Indirect but strongly confirmatory evidence in support of our theory is found in IG II² 704. The formulas and style of writing in this decree date it in the first half of the century. The secretary comes from Leontis and cannot be placed in Ferguson's cycle before 220, and Kirchner found himself unable to place the document according to any of the existing cycles. When, however, we grant the existence of Ptolemais in 232 we can place the decree in question in 257/6, a date with which all the other evidence is in accord.

This evidence is cumulative in its effect and seems to prove conclusively that Ptolemais held the secretaryship in 232. Athens gained her independence in the latter part of the preceding year and her hieromnemon appears at the Amphiktyonic Council at the earliest opportunity. In so far, therefore, as Delphic chronology depends upon the history of Athens, it must be revised to conform with this theory.

¹ The evidence is cited at length in AJP 1913, 381 ff.

² Cf. IG II² 775, 776, 780, 790; cf. AJP 1913, 405-407.

PROSOPOGRAPHY OF DELPHIAN ARCHONS, SENATORS, AND
HIEROMNEMONS.¹

- 302 Hierondas.
 301 Sylochos S. Echekratidas, Astykrates, Agion, Agathon,
 Thrasykles.
 S. Herakleidas, Aristomachos, So
 300 Eudokos S. Aristagoras, Lyson, Hieros, Ariston, Pei-
 sitheos, Praxeas?
 S. Kallikles, Ariston, Dexippos, Argilios.
 299 Athambos.
 298 Timon S. Archidamos, Xenon, Nikandros.
 297 Hippotas.
 296
 295 Ison S. Damochares, Damotimos, Astykrates, Dameas,
 Adeimantos.
 294 Lyson S. Boulon, Pythodoros, Eudoros.
 S. Melanopos, Thebagoras, Aristoxenos.
 293 Hieros S. Praochos, (Tim)ogenes, Deinon.
 292
 291 Dexippos S. Ison, Dameas, Nikias, Lykinos.
 S. Damokrates, Datys, Hierokles, Kleandros,
 Damostratos.
 290
 289 Xenochares.
 S. Echemmas, Kraton, Philondas, Ison, Alki-
 neidas.
 288 *Theoteles* S. Xenostratos, Etymondas, Kleon, Age (las).
 287 Herakleidas S. Athambos, Xenon, Iasimachos, Zakyntos.
 S. Kleon, Theugenes, Archiadas, Peisilas.
 286 *Orestas* S. Menandros, Kriton, Lykinos, Theoteles.
 S. Asphaltos, Lysidamos, Aristoxenos,
 De(xippos).
 285 Ornichidas S. Kallikrates, Sylochos, Charixenos, Hip-
 parchos, Lysidamos, Agelas.
 S. Theu , Nikias, rates.

¹ In the following list we have followed Pomtow's list of archons for the period 302-280, but we are responsible for the names printed in italics in that period. The use of italics in the remainder of the list implies that the date is only approximate.

- 284 *Philon* S. Kraton, Theuteles, Herakleidas, Peithagoras, Aristion.
- 283 Kleoboulos S. Korinthotimos.
- 282 *Erasippos* S. Charixenos, Aiakidas, Melission.
S. Archelas, Lysidamos, Nikias.
- 281 Aristoxenos S. Kallikrates, Apemantos, Maimalos.
- 280 Dioskouridas S. Kraton, Hipparchos, pheus.
- 279 *Iatadas* S. Deinon, os, Athanion, Eucharidas.
- 278 *Timokrates* S. Echemmas, Arist
- 277
- 276 *Hieron*.
- 275 *Kleu(timos)* S. Praochos, Athanion, M ,
. dros.
- 274 *Ainesilas* S. Xenon, Aristagoras, Theuskopos, Alkamenes, Chares.
S. Deinon, Amynandros, Ornichidas.
- 273 *Xenokles I* S. Aristomachos, Alkamenes.
- 272 *Kraton* S. Eudokos, Boulon, Aristion.
- 271 *Diodoros* S. Charixenos, Archelas, Echyllos.
S. Aristomachos, Aristokrates, Dameas, Nikodoros, Athambos.
- 270 *Aristion* S. Aiakidas, Epikrates, Mantias, Euagoras, Dion.
S. Damon, Andron, Menandros, Kleotimos.
- 269 *Archelas* S. Menandros, Damon, Kleotimos.
S. Kallikles, Nikodoros, Aristomachos.
- 268 Aristagoras S. Pythophanes, Aristeidas, Menes.
S. Charixenos, Theudoridas, Xenon, Euthyretos.
H. Echyllos, Eteokrates.
- 267 Charixenos S. Chares, Timokrates, Kalliphanes, Lyson.
S. Kriton, Aristokrates, Ornichidas, Nikodamos.
H. Larisios, Aristeidas,
- 266 Herakleidas S. Larisios, Damon, Nikodoros, Sakedallos.
S. Straton, Kleuphanes, Athambos, Ainesilas.
H. Agazalos, Amynandros.
- 265 Archiadas S. Ainesilas, Kleuphanes, Ari . . . , Straton?
(Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 100. 300).
S. Aristagoras, Damon, Archidamos, Philondas.
H. Anaxandridas, Nikodamos.

- 264 Eudokos S. Alkamenes, Lyson, Aischriondas, Nikias,
Menandros.
H. Herakleidas, Kriton.
- 263 Straton S. Lyson, Amynandros, Timogenes.
S. Orestas, Hippias, Deinon, Alkinos, Athanion.
H. Athambos, Ameinias.
- 262 Ariston S. Herakleidas, Maimalos, Tarantinos, Kleo-
phanes, Kalliphanes.
H. Lyson, Lykinos. (Klio 1914, p. 285.)
- 261 Androtimos S. Kleomantis, Eudokos, Aristion, Niko-
damos.
- 260 Aristagoras S. Straton, Damotimos, Erasippos, Nikoda-
mos, Emmenidas.
S. Damon, Tarantinos, Hieron, Euthydikos,
Hippon.
H. Archiadas, Mantias.
- 259 Emmenidas S. Kallikles, Xenon, Ariston, Archelas.
H. Kleodamos, Aischriondas.
- 258 Nikodamos H. Aristokrates, Andron.
- 257 Kleondas S. Andron, Archiadas, Alexarchos.
H. Boulon, Pyrrhinos.
- 256 *Onymokles* S. Nikaidas, Xenon, Boulon, Phainis.
S. Kleon, Orestas, Straton.
- 255 *Kallikles* S. Aischriondas, Xenon, Amphistratos, Hagnias,
Philomenes (cf. Fouill. III 1. 193).
H. Dexitheos, Herys.
- 254 Dion S. Echekratidas, Xenon, Euippos, Aristagoras.
S. Gorgippos, Glaukon, Euippos, Kleodoros, Patron.
H. Echekratidas, Nikaidas.
- 253 Ameinias S. . . . on, Damen(es), . . . es,
(Nik) aios? (Ditt. SIG I³ 405, note 2).
S. Timokrates, Athambos, Kallikles, Dexippos.
- 252 Amyntas S. Timokrates, Athambos, Kallikles, Erasippos.
S. Damon, Pason, Hippias, Eucharidas, Thar-
rikon.
H. Nikomachos, Agathon.
- 251 Nikaidas S. Chares, Amphistratos, Chairephanes.
H. Praochos, Kleomantis.
- 250 Praochos H. Herakleidas, Euthydikos, Tarantinos,
Epikratidas.

- 249 *Archidamos* S. Aristagoras, Damon, Athambos.
S. Kleomantis, Pythodoros, Agazalos, Thes-
salos.
- 248 *Aischriondas* S. Timokrates, Damaïos, Agion, Hieros.
S. Thrasykles, Xenochares, Hagnias, Hera-
kleidas.
- 247 *Herakleidas* S. Onymokles, Euthyon, Eudoros, Mnason,
Lysimachos.
S. Athambos, Mnasiatheos (cf. Klio 1914,
318 ff.).
- 246 *Boulon?* S. Pantandros (cf. GGA 1913, 166).
- 245 *Euthyon* S. Kleon, Kraton, Pason, Kriton, Kallikrates.
- 244 *Xenochares II* S. (Kleom)antis.
- 243 *Damochares* S. Damon, Damotimos, Kleonymos.
S. Antandros, Erasippos, Euarchidas.
- 242 *Damotimos* S. Pyrrhos, Kleuphanes, Kleinias, Philinos,
Kallikrates.
S. Mimneas, Xenon, Lyson, Archiadas,
Damon.
- 241 *Achaimenes* S. Kleomantis, Andron, Boulon, Pyrrhinos,
Mantias.
S. Iasimachos, Praxias, Emmenidas, Eche-
kratidas, Hippon.
- 240 *Nikarchos I* S. Praxias, Damarchos, Archiadas, Nikan-
dros, Botakos.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.